

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-22 remain in the application. Claims 4 and 6 have been amended.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claim 4 has been objected to "because the recitation of 'said at least one adjusting device' on line has 2 no proper antecedent basis". The Examiner's comments have been considered and the appropriate corrections have been made to claim 4 and, similarly, to claim 6.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, Counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to claims 4 and 6 are provided solely for the purpose of satisfying formal requirements or are made solely for cosmetic reasons to clarify the claims. The changes are neither provided for overcoming the prior art nor do they narrow the scope of the claim(s) for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

In the fourth paragraph on page 2 of the Office action, claims 1, 2, 14, 16 and 18-21 have been rejected as being anticipated by *Pensavecchia* (US 5,660,108) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

In the third paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 3-11, 15, and 22 have been rejected as being obvious over *Pensavecchia* in view of *Mueller et al.* (US 5,802,973) and *Drapatsky et al.* (US 5,103,733) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In the second paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, claim 17 has been rejected as being obvious over *Pensavecchia* in view of *Giori et al.* (US 6,101,939) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 (similarly claim 19) calls for, inter alia:

A modular printing machine system for printing on sheets, comprising:

a first printing machine of satellite construction type having a central first impression cylinder, and at least four printing devices assigned thereto;

a second printing machine having a second impression cylinder and a feeding device **disposed immediately up-line** of said second impression cylinder for feeding the sheets **directly** to said second impression cylinder; and

an adjusting device assigned to said feeding device, said **feeding device being at least partially displaceable by said adjusting device** for adjusting and correcting registration of said feeding device.


On page 3 of the Office action, the Examiner stated that:

The detailed structure of the sheet feeding device is shown in Fig. 1 of Pensavecchia wherein a front stopper (fingers) 77a moves vertically to register the sheet to be parallel with the axis of the impression cylinder and a conventional means is activated to push the sheet horizontally against a side guide to assure that the sheet is squared up and is in the correct axial position relative to the impression cylinder. The vertically and horizontally movable elements of the adjusting device form part of the sheet feeding device and are displaceable for adjusting and correcting registration of the sheet feeding device with respect to the impression cylinder. See Figs. 1, 2 and column 4, lines 46-53 in Pensaveechia for details.

Claim 1 recites "a feeding device **disposed immediately up-line** of said second impression cylinder for feeding the sheets **directly** to said second impression cylinder" and "[the] **feeding device** being at least partially displaceable by said adjusting device for adjusting and correcting registration of said feeding device".

In order for *Pensavecchia* to disclose a displaceable feeding device disposed immediately up-line of the second impression cylinder, the "accelerating rollers or wheels 72a and 72b" (col. 4, lines 57-58) would have to be displaceable. There is no indication in *Pensavecchia* that this is the case.

The relevant part of Fig. 1 of *Pensavecchia*, showing the second impression cylinder or "impression cylinder 22", the sheet feeding device or "accelerating rollers or wheels 72a and 72b", and the adjusting device or "registration station 77", is reproduced below.



Col. 4, lines 46-53 of *Pensavecchia* states:

The paper feeder delivers the paper to a registration station shown generally at 77. At this station, the leading edge of **the paper is stopped** by vertically movable fingers 77a that **register it** to be parallel to the axis of the impression cylinder. Once this is done, the paper is moved toward a side guide (not shown), by any conventional means, to assure that **it has been squared up** and is **in the correct axial position** relative to the impression cylinder.

(emphasis added)

According to the above passage of *Pensavecchia*, it is the paper (sheet) that is "displaceable by said adjusting device for adjusting and correcting registration", and **not** the feeding device as recited in the claims of the instant application.

Consequently, the invention as recited in claims 1 and 19 of the instant application is believed not to be anticipated by *Pensavecchia*.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that *Pensavecchia* does not show the features of claims 1 and 19. Claims 1 and 19 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and because claims 2-11 and 14-18 are ultimately dependent on claim 1 and since claims 20-22 are ultimately dependent on claim 19, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Considering the deficiencies of the primary reference *Pensavecchia*, it is believed not to be necessary at this stage

to address the secondary references *Mueller et al.*, *Drapatsky et al.*, and *Giori et al.* applied in the rejection of certain dependent claims, and whether or not there is sufficient suggestion or motivation with a reasonable expectation of success for modifying or combining the references as required by MPEP § 2143.

If an extension of time is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Markus Nollf  
Reg. No. 37,006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
For Applicant

June <sup>20</sup>~~18~~, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101